

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 2 and 6 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner (U.S. Patent No. 6,703,903), and further in view of Bloomfield (U.S. Patent No. 5,446,445), and further in view of Tanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,906).

The rejection is traversed below and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Skinner discloses a system and method for detecting an event and then notifying the user of the event. Bloomfield discloses a system and method of notifying a central system of an event detected by a mobile detection system. Tanabe discloses a robot teaching pendant for a robot system combined with a personal computer. Skinner, Bloomfield and Tanabe do not discuss about a robot that detects a user's voice, moves to where the user is assumed to be, and dials a pre-registered telephone number according to a request that is given by the user when the robot reaches the user.

The amended claim 1 recites:

"a storing section which stores map information providing a floor layout, a user location table providing a location of the user for each time zone, a reporting table providing telephone numbers and messages" "a voice recognition section which recognizes that the robot is called based on a voice received by the microphone," "a direction assuming section which assumes the direction of the voice detected by the microphone in response to the voice recognition section recognizing that the robot is called," "a movement control section which controls, when the direction assumed by the direction assuming section is the direction of a door, the moving mechanism so as to move the robot to a location provided in the user location table by referring to the map information and the user location table stored in the storing section as well as referring to the clock," and "a telephone control section which causes the communication section to dial one of the telephone numbers provided in the reporting table stored in the storing section in response to the detection section detecting the request provided by the user when the robot arrives at the location, and then delivers the associated message provided in the reporting table stored in the storing section as a voice message to a receiver when the receiver responds."

Thus, according to the claimed invention, upon detecting a voice of the user, the robot

can move to where the user is by referring to the pre-registered location table, receive a request from the user upon arriving at the location where the user is, and send a pre-registered voice message to a pre-registered destination according to the request.

Accordingly, Skinner, Bloomfield, Tanabe taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

The amended Independent claim 10 recites the features analogous to those recited in claim 1 and therefore, claim 10 is also patentable for the same reasons as those described above for claim 1. It is respectfully requested that claim 10 be allowed.

Claims 3-5, 7-9 are dependent from base independent claim 1 and therefore, claims 3-5, 7-9 are also patentable for the same reasons as those described above for claim 1. It is respectfully requested that claims 3-5, 7-9 be allowed.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakita (International Publication No. WO99/67067), and further in view of Skinner (U.S. Patent No. 6,703,903), and further in view of Tanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,906).

The rejection is traversed below and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Kawakita discloses a robot that recognizes user's condition and outputs a response message according to the recognition. Skinner discloses a system and method for detecting an event and then notifying the user of the event. Tanabe discloses a robot teaching pendant for a robot system combined with a personal computer. Kawakita, Skinner and Tanabe do not discuss about a robot that detects a user's voice, moves to where the user is assumed to be, and dials a pre-registered telephone number according to a request that is given by the user when the robot reaches the user.

The amended claim 1 recites:

"a storing section which stores map information providing a floor layout, a user location table providing a location of the user for each time zone, a reporting table providing telephone numbers and messages," "a voice recognition section which recognizes that the robot is called based on a voice received by the microphone," "a direction assuming section which assumes the direction of the voice detected by the microphone in response to the voice recognition section recognizing that the robot is called," "a movement control section which controls, when the direction assumed by the direction assuming section is the direction of a door, the moving mechanism so as to move the robot to a location provided in the user location table by referring to the map information and the user location table stored in the storing section as well as referring to the clock," and "a telephone control section which causes the communication section to dial one of the

telephone numbers provided in the reporting table stored in the storing section in response to the detection section detecting the request provided by the user when the robot arrives at the location, and then delivers the associated message provided in the reporting table stored in the storing section as a voice message to a receiver when the receiver responds." Thus, according to the claimed invention, upon detecting a voice of the user, the robot can move to where the user is by referring to the pre-registered location table, receive a request from the user upon arriving at the location where the user is, and send a pre-registered voice message to a pre-registered destination according to the request.

Accordingly, Kawakita, Skinner, and Tanabe taken separately or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

The amended Independent claim 10 recites the features analogous to those recited in claim 1 and therefore, claim 10 is also patentable for the same reasons as those described above for claim 1. It is respectfully requested that claim 10 be allowed.

Claims 3-5, 7-9 are dependent from base independent claim 1 and therefore, claims 3-5, 7-9 are also patentable for the same reasons as those described above for claim 1. It is respectfully requested that claims 3-5, 7-9 be allowed.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 4, 2008 By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501